DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 038 CE 015 682

TITLE	Executive Effectiveness and Organizational Team Building. Executive Personnel Technical Assistance Paper (EPTAP No. 5).
INSTITUTION	Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 77
NOTE	43p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 006-000-01036-9)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; *Change Strategies; Federal Programs; Helping Relationship; *Management Development; Organizational Climate; Organizational Communication; *Organizational Development; *Organizational Effectiveness; Problems; Program Development; Research; *Staff Improvement; *Teamwork; Training Techniques

ABSTRACT

This publication is fifth in a series of technical assistance papers intended to assist Federal agency personnel in the design and implementation of executive personnel management programs. This document focuses primarily upon team building, one of a variety of techniques of organization development designed to improve the way in which work is accomplished by individuals who have common work relationships and/or goals. The following information is included in this document: the basic concepts of team building; actual cases of federal applications of team building; potential problems in applying team building; and a description of some Civil Service Commission applied research in this area. An annotated bibliography is also provided. (BM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CE

EPTAP No. 5

ED153038

Executive Effectiveness and Organizational Team Building

November 1977

U.S. Civil Service Commission
Bureau of Executive Personnel
Executive Personnel Technical Assistance Center

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 015 682

This publication is the fifth in a series of technical assistance papers designed to assist Federal agency personnel in the design and implementation of executive personnel management programs. Formerly called Executive Manpower Management Technical Assistance Papers (EMMTAP's), the series has been renamed Executive Personnel Technical Assistance Papers (EPTAP's). Previous publications in this series are:

- Considerations in the Identification of Managerial Potential, EMMTAP No. 1, August 1973

- Suggestions for Individual Development Planning, EMMTAP No. 2, October 1973

- Decision Analysis Forecasting for Executive Manpower Planning, EMMTAP No. 3, June 1974

- Executive Personnel Planning Guidance, EPTAP No. 4, March 1977

This publication was prepared jointly by the Bureau of Executive Personnel, the Bureau of Training, the Federal Executive Institute, and the Bureau of Policies and Standards. Work group members included:

Wilton Dickerson, Bureau of Training
James Dullea, Bureau of Executive Personnel
Robert Pompa, Bureau of Executive Personnel
John Turney, Bureau of Policies and Standards
Georgeann Wilcoxson, Federal Executive Institute

Some materials for this paper were provided by Joseph Coffee and Paul Buchanon of the Department of Treasury, and by Patrick Conklin and Edward Jones of the Federal Executive Institute.

EXECUTIVE PERSONNEL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PAPER

(EPTAP No. 5)

EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL TEAM BUILDING

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock No. 026-000-00288-9

EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL TEAM BUILDING

CONTENTS

		Page No
I.	Introduction	1
II.	The Basic Concepts of Team Building	3
	A. What Is Team Building	3
	B. What May Be Accomplished through Team Building	5
	C. Factors Influencing the Success of Team Building	7
	D. Limitations of Team Building	8
	E. Establishing a Team Building Program	9
III.	Team Building Case Studies	11
	A. A New Field Office Director Begins with Team Building	11
	B. The Federal Executive Institute's Multi-Team Building	15
	C. Treasury's Do It Yourself Approach	16
	D. Political-Career Executive Team Building	21
	E. Off-Site Team Building Follow-up	24
IV.	Research Results -- What Do We Know	27
V.	Annotated Bibliography on Team Building	31

EXECUTIVE EFFECTIVENESS AND ORGANIZATIONAL TEAM BUILDING

I. INTRODUCTION

The Federal executive operates within a complex environment in which he or she is a member of various interrelated teams -- with subordinates, peers and superiors. Some teams consist solely of career civil servants. Others include noncareer policy-making executives as well as the career executives who are more concerned with seeing that policy decisions are carried out. Making these teams work effectively requires cooperation, mutual respect, coordination, and understanding. This paper deals with techniques which have helped some executives improve their ability to lead teams and to work as team members. Although we focus here primarily upon Team Building alone, it is used most effectively as an integral part of other organizational improvement efforts and executive development programs.

Although Team Building is intended primarily for achieving optimum organizational effectiveness, it is also an excellent process for developing executives. Executive development is often thought of as an individualized process (based on an Individual Development Plan) and this is one very practical way to approach the task of helping talented employees to develop the knowledge and abilities required of executives. However, it is also useful to think of executive development in an organizational context -- particularly when the object is to help

incumbent executives to grow on the job. After all, a very small part of the work day of most Federal executives is spent in lonely isolation. Executives are primarily involved in leading, coordinating, and working with groups of employees and other executives or with the chiefs of subordinate groups. Team Building expands the individualized approach to executive development to a "systems" approach.

During the past ten years, the Team Building facet of Organization Development (OD) has emerged as one of a variety of techniques designed to improve the way in which work is accomplished by individuals who have common work relationships and/or goals. Although there is no single, universally accepted definition of OD, it can be generally described as a managed process of systematic organizational change directed toward improving organizational effectiveness in achieving missions, goals or objectives. Other facets of OD include operations analysis, Grid organization development, survey feedback, MBO, multi-level planning, process consultation, etc.

In this paper, the basic concepts of Team Building are described; actual cases of Federal applications of Team Building are summarized; potential problems in applying Team Building are addressed; and a description of some Civil Service Commission applied research in this area is provided. Further, since this paper only scratches the surface, and is intended to serve as a catalyst for further exploration, an annotated bibliography has also been provided.

II. THE BASIC CONCEPTS OF TEAM BUILDING

A. What Is Team Building

Team Building can be defined as any planned and managed event involving a group of people who may or may not have common organizational relationships and/or goals. However, Team Building is most commonly used within organizations which have a common goal or task to be performed. Team Building is one approach to improving communications and work relationships so that more effective group functioning and task accomplishment can occur. The key point here is that Team Building centers around task accomplishment. It can be used by executives to deal with such matters as problem-solving, decision-making, policy formulation and goal setting. Team Building should not be confused with "T-Group" or "sensitivity training" which centers strictly around individual and interpersonal relationships. (The differences between these two processes are listed in Table A, Page 4.)

Team Building then is a process by which a trained internal or external consultant assists work group members through structured exercises to develop and maintain positive, integrated work relationships -- that is, to function more effectively together. It may center on tasks and activities performed by the group, the processes they use to accomplish their work, or interpersonal conflicts which affect task accomplishment.

The need for Team Building has to be carefully analyzed. The process cannot be viewed as a panacea for eliminating all problems or ineffective

TABLE A

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEAM BUILDING AND "T-GROUPS"*

	T-Group (Sensitivity Training)		Team Building Group
1.	Basically a group of strangers.	1.	Group has (or will have) a life together. May have lots of past history.
2.	"Here and now" data is the norm.	2.	"There and then" (past, present, and future data must be dealt with).
3.	Members are accountable to each other.	3.	Accountability is also to a larger system.
4.	Group forms just for the training.	4.	Group has reasons other than training to get together.
5.	Members are all on an equal basis.	5.	Members have differing authority, status, power and accountability.
6.	Group has power to distribute rewards and punishments.	6.	Power to reward and punish is unequally distributed, and controls are often external to the group.
7.	Agenda is intra and inter-personal.	7.	Agenda can be work or task centered issues. Inter-personal or intrapersonal issues relevant only to the extent they affect task.
8.	Develops as a self-contained mini-society.	8.	Requires awareness of larger system of which group is merely a part.
9.	All action takes place in group.	9.	Subgroups may form and constant activity is always occurring outside group.
10.	Reality is measured against the feeling within the group.	10.	Reality is measured against factors in the larger system and feelings are only part of the data.
11.	T-Groups are traditionally voluntary.	11.	It is questionable whether an organizationally sponsored activity focused on increasing task effectiveness can be viewed as voluntary even when so intended by the manager or consultant.

*Alban, Billie T. and Pollitt, L. Irving. "Team Building," in OD - Emerging Dimensions and Concepts. Edited by T. H. Pattern, Jr., American Society for Training and Development, 1973; pp. 33-42.

behavior. Factors such as organizational culture, leadership styles, organization structure, and communication links all play an important part in deciding whether to use the team-building process. For example, it would be futile to expect Team Building to bring about significant improvement in an organization which has severe structural problems or a significant number of marginal performers.

It is also important to realize that Team Building is most effective when used as a part of a longer range strategy for organizational and personal development. Other OD or management improvement techniques may be more appropriate in many cases. Team Building simply attempts to eliminate barriers to collaborative behaviors by developing skills that foster greater group attention and direction to the achievement of tasks.

B. What May Be Accomplished through Team Building

Team Building has the potential for developing an executive staff with higher confidence in joint mission accomplishment in an environment that is supportive and trusting. Also, because it stimulates more open acceptance of differences among team members and between related teams, it can have a significant effect upon individual and organizational growth. Much of the theory and technology of Team Building is based on assumptions that emphasize growth and expansion of team potential. A problem-solving rather than a fault-finding orientation will assist in promoting team and individual growth.

353-030 O - 78 - 3

"The results of Team Building can range from comparatively modest changes in the Team's operating mechanisms; e.g., gathering agenda items from more sources, to much deeper changes; e.g., modifying Team members' behavior patterns or the nature and style of the group's management, or developing greater openness and trust."* Team Building can result in:

1. Making the team a more effective problem-solving unit.

2. Providing the team a more effective climate in which to work.

3. More openness in communicating about the issues that are central to group and individual effectiveness.

4. Increased awareness of and competence in dealing with conflict and change.

5. New understanding of the ways in which the group operates and the benefit of these methods.

6. Expanded insights into members' and teams' roles and purposes in the larger setting; increased ability to work with other groups.

7. Stronger feelings of support and interdependence among members with more emphasis on collaboration and less on competition.

---

*Huse, Edgar F., Organization Development and Change, West Publishing Company, 1975, pp. 231.

C. Factors Influencing the Success of Team Building

In general, team-building efforts are influenced by a number of key factors; the people involved, the perceived relevance of the activity to personal and organizational problems, timing, and the degree of commitment and control the team has in making appropriate changes. An executive who selects Team Building as a course of action must be genuinely committed to organizational improvement. Team members must acknowledge that improvement is possible and be willing to give Team Building a chance to bring about change. For Team Building to succeed, an atmosphere of trust and openness must be established so that basic problems will be objectively identified and constructive solutions planned. However, you don't need an idyllic atmosphere in order to start. The first stages of the team-building process are designed to develop at least the minimum of understanding and mutual respect which the group will need to objectively identify problems and constructively plan solutions.

Particularly in the initial team-building stage a professionally-trained consultant can be helpful. The consultant, being an objective listener, is in a much better position to monitor the group and to keep its agenda focused on understanding and diagnosing the team's problems in achieving organizational objectives.

Timing is also a crucial factor. Team-building activities can be particularly appropriate when an external event or internal crisis has helped to identify a problem. A consultant also needs time to gather pertinent

data related to the situation and to provide the appropriate feedback and guidance to the team.

Team members should have wide latitude to discuss possible organizational changes and the various constraints upon bringing about such changes. The more freedom and involvement of the team members, the more honest the appraisal will be of what can reasonably be accomplished. Team Building can result in significant growth if the following conditions exist:

1. The team does not have severe interpersonal problems.
2. A sincere desire for growth producing change is present.
3. An adequate amount of time is set aside for the session.
4. A competent consultant is used as a facilitator.
5. A firm commitment for follow-up and evaluation activities.

D. Limitations of Team Building

There are, of course, limitations to the effectiveness of Team Building and these are often tied to the style, needs, and aspirations of the team leader. At a minimum the manager who leads the team must be prepared to deal with a more open system -- one that is likely to surface personal concerns and comments that are not always positive or complimentary. Once these feelings have been surfaced and discussed, there is often a significant reduction in the level of hostility. Where members of the group harbor deep seated interpersonal anger related to the work environment, it may be wise to postpone the team-building process until

the interpersonal problems have been mutually explored on a one-to-one basis. The effectiveness of Team Building is inevitably linked to the willingness and ability of senior members, particularly the leader, to demonstrate genuine support for the outcomes desired. To make the meetings realistic in terms of expectations, the team should be encouraged to (1) deal with problems over which those present have control, (2) set an agenda that will be attainable in the time available, (3) enhance problem-solving skills rather than attempt to solve all team problems, (4) work hard to reinforce newly acquired individual and group skills, and (5) pass along to their own groups some of the new attitudes, skills, and behaviors.

Obviously, change cannot be expected overnight. One of the key factors in the successful application of Team Building is the time-consuming process of follow-up and evaluation involved. The team leader must continuously evaluate the effects of Team Building, readjust strategies, and reinforce positive changes resulting from the team-building effort. Numerous sessions may be necessary, particularly if turnover occurs among team leaders and members. One must always keep in mind that organizational change is a very slow process.

E. Establishing a Team Building Program

Team Building, if it is appropriate in a particular situation, must be a thoroughly planned process. The following items are only some of the key factors which would be considered in planning a team-building effort:

1. What kind of team-building approach would be most appropriate? (Objectives, organizational levels involved, organizational environment, single or multi-team building?).

2. Team facilitators -- advantages and disadvantages of going outside of the agency or developing an internal agency capability. (Facilitators need to be objective and have a long-term commitment.)

3. Setting the tone and building support strategies for involving top management and for explaining the nature and purpose of Team Building and its potential benefits.

4. Selecting the initial teams -- desirability of starting near the top (political managers should be involved whenever practicable). Members of initial teams can then serve as members of or catalysts for lower echelon teams.

5. Location of the effort -- is it best to get away from the office for the initial sessions and/or follow-up sessions?

6. Relate to work -- the team is not an end in itself. Members will benefit and the program will benefit if the focus is upon real work issues.

7. Follow-up and evaluation -- what strategies will be used to keep teams alive and productive?

For assistance and information about the team-building process or team-building programs available, the following Civil Service Commission resources may be contacted:

General Management Training Center
Bureau of Training
Washington, DC 20415
FTS 8-632-4472
AC 202-632-4472

Federal Executive Institute
Route 29 North
Charlottesville, VA 22903
FTS 8-937-1295
AC 804-296-0181

III. TEAM BUILDING CASE STUDIES

The following case studies show Federal Government applications of Team Building in actual situations. However, in most instances, the names of organizations and individuals are deleted or disguised. The fact that Team Building worked in these situations is not intended to suggest that there have been no failures or projects with inconclusive results. Successful applications such as these call for careful planning, a relatively healthy organizational situation at the start of the program, top management determination to make the technique work, and systematic follow-up.

A. A New Field Office Director Begins with Team Building

The director of a district office in a large Federal administrative agency retired after serving over a decade. Soon after the new District Director, Carl Wright, arrived on the job, he found that district office operations had become lethargic and inefficient, largely due to performance

related factors. In his former position in the agency, Carl had previously taken part in a problem-solving team-building program and thought a similar undertaking would help achieve increased organizational effectiveness in the district. He called upon Dr. Alfred Garcia, a consultant who assisted in the earlier team-building sessions, to help him plan and conduct the program.

Carl, Dr. Garcia, and the installation training officer agreed to start the team-building process with a three day meeting of all 36 managers in the district. The objectives of the meeting were to identify current operating practices, to formulate desired ways of operating, and to develop improvement plans for shifting from current to desired operating conditions. They realized that there would be a need for systematic follow-through on the improvement plans and that at least one additional meeting of all managers would be necessary to review progress, modify existing plans, or develop new ones.

Carl opened the three-day meeting by outlining his personal concerns and objectives for improving district operations. He promised to establish a more positive, collaborative mode of operation and stated his readiness to accept the views of others and to fully participate in the team-building process. After Carl presented the objectives of the meeting, Dr. Garcia explained that his role was to facilitate the team-building process and to provide a professional, objective viewpoint. He then helped the group to share and clarify attitudes towards the team-building

endeavor. He also reviewed the phases of problem-solving, explained that these phases would serve as a road map for the meeting, and conducted a two-hour practice session in effective listening and group problem-solving.

The remainder of the first day was spent in applying the problem-solving process to the performance review system used by the district office. Carl worked directly with groups of managers with similar responsibilities who were assigned the task of preparing written descriptions of how performance reviews were currently handled. After these descriptions were shared in a general session, each of the groups worked out its view of how performance reviews should be conducted. Again, the results were shared in a general session. Heterogeneous groups including division, branch, and unit managers then reached agreement on desired ways of conducting performance reviews. Finally, under Carl's chairmanship, the entire group agreed upon procedures for the conduct of future performance reviews and actions needed (who was to do what, and by when).

Following a critique of steps taken during the first day, a group composed of branch, and unit managers met to identify additional issues and problems. Then the group process described above was repeated, including development of action plans.

On the third day, Carl and some of the group members met to discuss a number of his recent actions and the rationale behind them. Although

253-030 O - 78 - 3

sensitive issues were raised, the discussion was quite candid and clarifying information was given in a climate of understanding, not defensiveness.

Six months later a one-day follow-up conference of all managers was held to review progress and deal with any new issues. After a brief introduction, the same heterogeneous groups met to consider what had been done on each of the issues. If actions had been taken, had they accomplished the objectives, if not, why? Reports on improvement plan achievements were then shared. The reports indicated that some action had been taken on all issues. However, all groups reported considerable room for more improvement in working in a collaborative mode. Problems mentioned by the groups were listed on the blackboard and Dr. Garcia gave a lecture on obstacles to participative management, using examples from the reports.

Each subgroup then took two of the listed problems, analyzed them, and prepared some alternative courses of action. These analyses and alternatives were then reviewed by the total group, which then agreed upon action plans to resolve the problems. Another meeting to check progress was set for three months later.

Carl had set in motion a cycle of collaborative problem-solving activities which not only developed better operating procedures, but involved all of his managers in a team effort to revitalize district operations.

B. The Federal Executive Institute Multi-Team Building Program

The Federal Executive Institute (FEI) conducts "Multi-Team Building" Workshops which bring together three or more teams (usually interrelated) for a shared one-week session. Following is a report on this program (edited for brevity) as it appeared to one team in the workshop. This team consisted of a Federal research center director, his deputy, a technical assistant, a personnel management specialist, and six division chiefs.

"Six agencies were represented at this session. During the first 2½ days, our installation team did not work as an organic group. Rather, the participants in the workshop were divided into eight-member Executive Learning Teams and the facilitator concentrated on introducing us to the group process in a 'low risk' atmosphere. The session began with the preparation and presentation of skits by each learning team. This proved to be an icebreaker and an interesting illustration of group dynamics as leaders emerged, tasks were clarified, and a group of strangers rapidly became a cohesive group. This exercise was followed by lectures on Team Building and exercises in group problem-solving, interspersed with workshops directed at personal development and the processes of personal and organizational change.

"The following evening we returned to our original installation team. From that point on our only contact with the other workshop participants was during meals and at three plenary meetings.

"The rest of the week was primarily devoted to identifying actual problems and mapping out plans for improvement. Faculty facilitators guided us in the group problem-solving process and occasionally acted as 'referees'.

"Our first follow-up meeting was held two weeks later back at our Center with all team members and representatives from their branches. Team members described the team-building process, their personal impressions, the positive things they discovered about team members, and the problems they had identified to work on upon their return to the Center. Since mutual support of all senior staff at the Center was needed in order to apply what was learned, it was hoped that this meeting would help those at the next level of supervision to feel they were part of the team and to impart this attitude to their subordinates.

"From a questionnaire completed four months later we learned that the team members felt the training was worthwhile. However, there was some disappointment that follow-up activities to sustain the attitudes and frankness experienced at the FEI Workshop were too infrequent. Since the team-building sessions were just a beginning, we must work continually to apply and practice what we learned."

C. Treasury's Do-It-Yourself Approach

During 1976, the Department of the Treasury decided to use Organization Development (OD), including Team Building, as another approach to improving the effectiveness of its executives and other managers. Starting

from the premise that managers move up in rank because of their effectiveness and accomplishments within an organization, it was felt that certain OD techniques could be used as part of the executive development process. Thus, in November 1976, the Department initiated a pilot Three-Phase Executive/Management Development Program. This program was Treasury's initial approach to integrating OD and executive development. Following is a description of this approach.

Preliminary Steps

May-June 1976 - An organization and training needs analysis was conducted in eight Treasury bureaus.*

June 1976 - A proposal was submitted through Treasury's Director of Personnel to the Assistant Secretary for Administration with a request that the Department fund the program. The Assistant Secretary allocated $12,000 to cover the costs of participation for four bureau teams. These funds covered costs for all materials, room and board for 32 participants and three facilitators, as well as travel expenses of the latter.

July 1976 - Formal proposals were sent to six bureau heads. Each proposal outlined the identified organizational and training needs, and the extent to which the Three-Phase Program was intended to meet those needs.

---

*One source for further information on needs analysis is Analyzing Performance Problems, Robert F. Mager and Peter Pipe, Fearon Publishers, Belmont, California - 1970

September 1976 - Four bureaus were selected to participate in the program: the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (regulatory and enforcement functions), Bureau of the Mint (a production function), Office of the Secretary (policy and program oversight functions), and Savings Bonds Division (a sales function).

October 1976 - Eight managers from each bureau were selected by the bureau heads. These eight member groups worked as teams during the first two phases. They were GS-15's and 16's and represented cross sections of their bureaus.

The Three Phases of the Team-Building Process

Phase I began in November 1976 with a four-day residential session designed to give team members an opportunity to analyze their own current and potential effectiveness and the effectiveness of their bureaus, especially regarding the interrelationships among team members. The facilitators were the Regional Commissioner, Miami Region, U.S. Customs Service; the Assistant Commissioner, Administration, Government Financial Operations; and the Departmental Executive Development Coordinator. The Assistant Secretary for Administration participated in the opening session. Introductory sessions were conducted by the Executive Development Coordinator. The two Department level executives who served as facilitators were not team-building specialists. They had, however, been exposed to Team Building while attending the Federal Executive Institute's seven-week Senior Executive Education Program.

They served as objective observers in group sessions and later told how they had handled similar issues.

Phase I was intended to expand the insights of top managers about their bureau's needs and to help them focus on their roles, and their organization's roles and functions within the context of their bureau's mission. This team-building session also increased the individual participant's ability to work with groups, to better perceive the need for interdependence throughout their bureau, and to appreciate the utility of Team Building as a means of increasing their organization's effectiveness as well as their own.

Utilizing the team-building skills learned in Phase I, Phase II required each team to prepare a list of bureau needs and problems, and a recommendation for solving at least one of the problems. Each team then presented the list and recommendations to its bureau's Deputy Director. The primary purpose of this phase was to elicit top management support and commitment prior to the initiation of Phase III.

Phase III consists of open-ended follow-on activities which provide bureau heads and managers with opportunities to help improve organizational effectiveness. It is up to these managers to determine organizational needs (or problems) so that Phase III can be tailored to meet those needs. Various OD approaches, including Team Building, are the

primary tools for improving organizational effectiveness in the Three-Phase Program. When OD techniques are inappropriate to the situation, bureaus are directed to other approaches to meet their needs.

Initial Results

A situational management approach was used in the Three-Phase Program. This allowed Phase I to be primarily an analytical effort and at the same time it provided team members with opportunities to increase their skills in working with and leading teams. According to the participants, this aspect of the program was highly successful and they are able to apply the skills and knowledges developed in the team-building sessions. More importantly, the program has begun to have significant impact on the organizations involved. Five months after completion of Phase I and II, some of the results were:

- One bureau team continued to use the team-building process and it has made significant recommendations to the Assistant Secretary for Administration on ways to increase organizational effectiveness within the Office of the Secretary.

- Another bureau team was asked by the bureau's Deputy Director to continue to work together to make recommendations to resolve a significant organizational problem.

- One bureau team has convinced top bureau management to conduct its own team-building session and enter into a total OD effort.

- As a result of follow-up meetings between the Executive Development Coordinator and the participating Deputy Directors, two bureaus are undertaking major revisions of their executive and management development programs.

- Many managers who participated in the first two phases are now either beginning or considering team-building sessions for their own units.

While the results are not conclusive, this appears to be a promising low-cost approach. Treasury is now in the process of developing the expertise of managers and others in the department so that there will be sufficient in-house capability in the OD area. This effort dovetails with the overall executive and management development efforts of the department.

D. Political-Career Executive Team Building

The Federal Executive Institute offers a team-building program for non-career officials (political appointees) and their teams. A typical team would consist of an Assistant Secretary and his or her top political executives, special assistants, and career executives. One actual session was held for a team headed by a newly appointed Assistant Secretary who was previously employed in a teaching post in a technical discipline at a State university. The group was a "team" in only the most general sense of the term. Half the members -- including the Assistant Secretary

-- had been on the team for periods ranging from only three weeks to two months. The other half of the team had been with the agency for periods ranging from fifteen to thirty years. The newest members of the team were political appointees, with widely differing amounts and kinds of political involvement ranging from long-term high level partisan activity of national scope to very limited and strictly local political activity. The career members of the team had seen many administrations (and many more Assistant Secretaries) come and go. They held the highest career positions in the Department and were "experienced transitioners."

The Assistant Secretary, though faced with immediate and pressing programmatic and political demands in his new role, felt it essential to begin a team-building process as soon as possible. He recognized that the Federal Executive Institute had a time-tested team-building program and that the FEI atmosphere was conducive to the type of team-building process that was needed.

Arriving at FEI late on a Tuesday afternoon, the team engaged in a brief activity designed to identify the participants' level of expectations for the two-day session which was to follow. After a social period and dinner which allowed them to meet other executives in residence at FEI, there was an evening session on personal and career goals. The session format allowed each member of the group to listen to and observe all of the other group members as the activity unfolded. This helped to create

a climate of openness and trust, and also gave each individual practice in using a variety of skills, including those involved in effective listening, observing, and asking for and giving helpful feedback.

At the suggestion of the facilitator, the members of the team reviewed and analyzed their reactions to the "getting started" activities and then turned to the development of lists of office "helps and hindrances" and lists of their individual "three wishes" for improving office operations.

Having posted the lists around the room, and having "walked through" the items listed with questions of clarification, the team moved into its "work group" mode with the Assistant Secretary chairing the proceedings. An agenda item from the "hindrances" list was selected and a problem-solving exercise began with the facilitator acting as an impartial observer who periodically "stopped the action" to make process observations and brief "theory inputs" as appropriate. The group completed the problem-solving exercise and developed -- after some detours along the way -- a written Action Agenda Item describing in some detail Who Was Going To Do What, with Whom, for What Purpose, by When. Follow-up commitments for later reporting were then made. The group expressed great satisfaction with the sense of "teamness" achieved during this particular problem-solving activity and moved on to other items which had been identified as problems.

By the close of the two-day session the group had worked as a problem-solving team on a number of items, with varying degrees of success. Team members were quite conscious of many effects that "newness" was having; i.e., the necessity for provision of specific data, the tendency of the more senior members of the team to fall back on history, the problems of role ambiguity and, the obvious impatience of the newer members of the team. Several times during the session the group measured its progress using a Team Development Scale provided by the facilitator. This provided the group with a great deal of diagnostic data for use in its future sessions.

This team learned a great deal about itself. However, tne members recognized that the team-building process would have to continue in order to produce lasting benefits. One of the senior members of the team observed, "We tried this once before and we really worked well together until we stopped doing it (Team Building)."

E. Off-Site Team Building Follow-up

What happens after an off-site team-building session? How does the team overcome the pressures in the work setting which interfere with follow-through action and with a shift in routine from the old to the newly-learned and agreed-on practices?

Hank Stromboli is a director of a functional division in the Washington headquarter's office of a large administrative agency. He supervises

two large branches in the Washington office and is indirectly responsible for the management of his function in the agency's seven regions and thirty-five field units. After observing operations in his functional area for some time, Hank determined that performance in a number of areas was being impeded by an excessively authoritarian style of management which was characterized by a one-way boss-to-subordinate communication pattern. He believed that this style of operation was stifling innovation and producing a wasteful rigidity in operating practice. Hank selected Team Building as the first step in resolving this problem situation.

Before initiating the team-building effort, Hank laid out a tentative six-month plan involving his immediate staff, the two branches in the national office, and the seven regional executives. The first step was a two-day problem-solving session for Hank and his immediate staff. The session was conducted with the help of Dr. Lillian Kelly, an internal consultant in residence for two years. The design for the session called for collaborative problem-solving focused on the problems involved in shifting to a less autocratic management style and from essentially one-way to "all channel" communication. Systematic problem-solving procedures were tried out and adopted. By the end of the second day Hank's immediate staff had prepared a list of key issues and had developed follow-up plans for dealing with them.

Dr. Kelly assisted the two branch chiefs in the conduct of similar team-building meetings. While these meetings initially appeared successful, there was no immediate follow-through. This appears to have been the result of work pressures and uncertainty as to how to deal with an unfamiliar idea imposed from above. Approximately, eighteen months later, these branches did, on their own initiative, begin to work again with Dr. Kelly.

At the next semi-annual meeting of the Washington office staff and regional executives, two of the three days were spent in problem-oriented Team Building. With Dr. Kelly's assistance, these sessions were very different from previous meetings with the regional executives. Longstanding policies and practices were openly criticized and the regional officials, after "letting off steam," became actively involved in finding areas for improvement. Three issues meriting follow-up action were identified and groups of headquarters and regional executives were formed to work on each. Reports were submitted for total group consideration and decision-making at the next semi-annual meeting. Each of the meetings since has been jointly planned by headquarters and regional executives. The person who plans the work on each agenda item chairs that part of the discussion, while the progress of the discussion is recorded on wall-charts. The process is mainly problem-solving rather than information giving, and critiques of progress are held at intervals during and at the end of each session.

A year and a half after Hank initiated the project, four of the seven regional executives and two of the field unit chiefs had requested and received aid from Dr. Kelly in conducting team-building sessions with their staffs. In addition, more than a year after the Washington branch team-building activity began, one of the branches resumed Team Building with Dr. Kelly's assistance. Hank's effort in the national office continued on a regular basis with semi-annual full-day reviews and critiques of impact on organizational performance. In the judgment of team members, much has been accomplished and new improvement avenues have been identified as earlier objectives have been attained.

IV. RESEARCH RESULTS -- WHAT DO WE KNOW?

The fundamental purpose of research on executive Team Building and other OD techniques is to determine the nature of their impact on how the team and its subordinate elements accomplish their work. Team Building focuses on change processes and, therefore, impact must be measured in terms of change. Research can attempt to detect changes in the perceptions, attitudes and behaviors of executives who have participated in team-building exercises and/or changes in how effectively their team actually functions in getting work done. More direct short-term changes are likely to occur in perceptions and attitudes which are not constrained by the nature of the surrounding work environment. In other words, team-building participants can expresss their perceptions and attitudes in a survey without concern for the impact of these responses on other employees

and aspects of the organization itself. While they may view Team Building positively, they run into resistance on the part of other employees or stringent task requirements which restrict what they can utilize from their team-building experiences. Measurement of behavioral change and actual changes in group effectiveness generally require a long-term, more ambitious research effort which allows such organizational influences to operate actively. This extended research is necessary in order to fully test the extent to which Team Building achieves its ultimate objective of making a group function more effectively.

There are certain fundamental issues which must be addressed in conducting research on Team Building. First of all, it is important to make clear what in fact is being evaluated. Team-building programs come in many shapes and sizes. Some rely heavily on the skills of a consultant to guide the team through a series of improvement steps. Others rely more on structured exercises to develop group functioning processes. It is important to document this content so that the research can provide some conclusions as to what in fact has positive, neutral, or negative impact on group functioning.

Secondly, it is important to clarify what results are anticipated from the Team Building. In other words, what perceptions, behaviors, and aspects of group effectiveness are in fact being addressed by the team-building program. Clearer perceptions of assigned tasks and role

requirements, more coordinating communications among team members, and greater utilization of group problem-solving are possible changes in perceptions and behaviors. In turn, given that effects are detected in these variables, attention then should focus on changes in how effectively the team functions in terms of the quality or quantity of its output or the output of units it directs.

While there have been many reports of positive testimonials obtained from participants in team building programs, these reports are based on participant impressions following completion of the program. They lack any clear "before team-building" data reference points to use in determining change in perceptions, behaviors, and group output. There has been little research conducted which provides such comparisons and the studies which are available focus only on changes in the perceptions of participants.

Blake and Mouton* reported a range of such data based on executive team-building sessions conducted in a variety of organizational settings. Among their general findings, they report that team members show more agreement on the properties of an ideal team and are more critical of their own team after Team Building. Members perceive that their teams are more supportive of effective performance. In addition, there is more open, forthright communication and more explicit, team-wide objective setting taking place. Golembiewski and Kiepper** reported on the

---

*Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S., Corporate Excellence Through Grid Organization Development. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Co., 1968

**Golembiewski, R.T. & Kiepper, A., "MARTA: Toward an effective, open Giant," Public Administration Review, Jan Feb 1976, pp. 46-60

effects of Team Building for the senior staff of the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority. Participants indicated an increase in group effectiveness, increased approachability to their supervisor, and increases in mutual influence, personal involvement, participation, and trust.

Such perceptual data are useful in providing some indication that Team Building does in fact have an impact. However, they are subject to perceptual biases or distortions. Therefore, it is necessary to collect objective data indicating the impact of Team Building on actual behavior and group effectiveness. The current research program of the Organizational Psychology Section within the Personnel Research and Development Center of the Civil Service Commission incorporates this focus. The intent is to examine the full impact of Team Building as well as other OD techniques through the determination of actual changes in behaviors and effectiveness resulting from the application of these techniques in various Federal agencies. More specifically, this program focuses on: (1) the impact of various team-building formats or approaches; (2) the identification of specific problem areas such as inadequate coordination of team member activities which are best addressed by Team Building rather than some alternative technique; and (3) the utility of Team Building relative to other techniques or in combination with other techniques. For example, certain organizational functioning processes may best be improved by Team Building preceded by a management development program and followed by a job enrichment intervention. The organi-

zational psychology research program will be examining the full range of issues related to the impact of Team Building and other OD techniques in order to provide the Federal executive with a clearer picture of what he or she can expect to achieve in terms of getting work done more effectively and improving employee productivity and satisfaction.

V. AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY ON TEAM BUIDING

A. For Executives

1.) Huse, Edgar F. Organization Development and Change. New York: West Publishing, 1975; Chapter 8, "Concern with Personal work style," pp. 217-246.

Huse begins with an explanation of the conceptual framework behind Team Building. Individuals and groups have a mutual influence on each other and a group's efforts are successful to the extent that its members have effective working relationships with one another. In turn, these interpersonal relationships are affected by the degree of openness with which feelings and emotions are expressed. Team Building is aimed at both helping a team perform its tasks better and satisfying individual needs. The author uses Johnson's definition of Team Building: "Any planned event with a group of people who have or may have common organization relationships and/or goals which are designed to improve the way in which work gets done by them in some way or another."

Huse lists five types of teams found in organizations and then classifies types of Team Building by results achieved. Beer's four models, each of which contains elements of action research and data feedback, are described for the personal model; the role model; and the managerial grid model. Huse includes a list of factors inhibiting successful Team Building. The chapter examines the general process of Team Building, looks at different types of Team Building activities and goals as well as at several case histories. It also examines selected aspects of Team Building: family diagnostic meeting, family Team Building and new manager orientation.

2.) Bennis, Warren G. The Nature of Organization Development. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

This book provides a very good introduction to OD, particularly in showing the benefits of team-building type interventions when they are appropriate. One case describes the effect of a team-building effort in reducing inter-group conflict between State Department Administrative Officers and Foreign Service Officers.

Also useful for training officers and other staff specialists.

3.) Beckhard, Richard. Organization Development: Strategies and Models. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1969; Chapter 3, "Strategies, Tactics and Targets of Organization Development," pp. 26-42.

This chapter provides an overview of the organization development intervention techniques beginning with Team Development. Various models for Team Building are briefly presented but more thorough coverage is given to activities suggested for development of new teams. The chapter treats OD interventions as a whole and helps an executive see possibilities for more than one approach. Chapters which follow are devoted to case studies, most of which use some form of Team Building. These cases serve as good examples of the integration of Team Building into the total OD process.

4.) Fordyce, Jack K. and Weil, Raymond. Managing with People. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1971.

The most useful part of this plain-talking handbook for managers is part three: Methods. It includes detailed procedures for conducting team-building meetings, including manager diagnostic team meeting series, confrontation goal-setting meetings, family group team-building meeting and the inter-group team-building meeting. Graphic flow charts are used effectively to show procedures for choosing among alternative strategies and for carrying out successful meetings. Additional hints for successful team-building meetings are given in the sections called, "Methods for Finding Out What Is Going On, Methods for Better Meetings and Methods for Changing the Quality of Relationships." The author gives very detailed suggestions ranging from physical arrangements to icebreaking techniques. These chapters are very useful to any executive or training officer responsible for setting up a team-building meeting.

Also useful for training officers and other staff specialists.

5.) Patten, Thomas H. and Dorey, Lester E. "Long-Range Results on a Team Building OD Effort," Public Personnel Management (January-February, 1977); pp. 31-50.

This article reports the results of an extensive evaluation of team-building seminars conducted for high-ranking civilian and military managers in the U.S. Army Communications Command and subordinate commands. Goals for the team-building workshops centered on trust, conflict resolution, understanding motivation, basic managerial skills, MBO and organizational rewards. Participants reported a number of positive effects from the team-building seminars in follow-up interviews conducted at least six months after the seminars. While this study provides some needed information on the effects of the team-building process, it should be noted that teams were composed mainly of "cousins" and "semi-strangers" rather than "families."

Also useful for researchers.

6.) Harvey, Donald F. and Brown, Donald R. An Experiential Approach to Organization Development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976; Chapter 13, "Team Building and Development," pp. 265-286.

The team development process is defined as an educational process of continually reviewing and evaluating team functioning and identifying and establishing new and more effective ways of operating. Six steps, normally guided by a consultant, are described for the team development process: initiating the meeting, setting objectives, collecting data, planning the meeting, conducting the meeting, and evaluating the process. Six steps for conducting the role analysis technique are also presented.

7.) Bechard, R. "Optimizing Team-Building Efforts." Journal of Contemporary Business, 1972, 1 (3), pp. 23-32.

Four general purposes (other than sharing information) are suggested for group meetings: (1) establishing goals or priorities, (2) analyzing and distributing the work, (3) examining how the group works, and (4) examining the relationships among the group members as they work.

Beckhard notes that consultants and managers tend to rank-order these purposes differently in terms of importance. This situation is the cause of misused energy in team-building efforts. The proposed solution is to sort out the rank-orderings to select a single primary purpose. It is the responsibility of the team leader to select this purpose and the responsibility of the third-party consultant to facilitate the work within the limits of that purpose.

8.) Davis, S.A. "Building More Effective Teams." Innovation, 1970, 15, pp. 32-41.

A distinction is made between Team Building and T-Groups. T-Groups are temporary and have as their main goal individual learning. Team Building, on the other hand, is described as "...introspection among a group of people who work together more or less continuously."

For Team Building to be effective, three elements are necessary: (a) time, (b) participation of all members of the team, and (c) a consultant who is not a complete stranger to the group.

The consultant strives for two things in Team Building: (a) "One is getting the team members to really hear each other and to understand the issues in a relatively nondefensive way." (b) "the second ...is a realization on the part of team members that there are alternatives to the present way of functioning."

B. For Training Officers and Other Staff Specialists

1.) Argyris, C. Intervention Theory and Method. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

This book provides a theoretical basis for organizational interventions such as Team Building. Although it should be read in the context of Argyris' other work, it does link contemporary organizational theory with organization development.

2.) Duffin, Richard; Falusi, Arnold; Lawrence, Philip; and Morton, Robert B. "Increasing Organizational Effectiveness," Training and Development Journal 27 (April, 1973);

This article describes the results of organization development in an Ontario, Canada, Board of Education over a three-year period. The most significant result in terms of Team Building was that by working on issues that were controversial and important to all concerned, the administrative units have developed a greater feeling of unity and common purpose. There is evidence of more resolution of conflict by the members who share the conflict, rather than forcing higher management intervention.

3.) French, Wendell L. and Bell, Cecil. Organization Development. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973; Chapter 9-11, pp. 97-126.

Chapter 9, "OD Interventions -- An Overview," emphasises that an OD intervention is an activity; it is something which happens in an organization which involves the organization. Team Building activities may relate to ways to perform the task better or to ways to improve relations between team members. The authors use a neat classification scheme for OD interventions: all interventions are classified according to how they fall along two dimensions -- Individual-Group and Task-Process. This classification is helpful in comparing Team Building to other interventions such as Process Consultation and Survey Feedback.

Chapter 10, "Team Interventions," treats team-building activities as the most important group of interventions. Besides describing Family Group Team Building, the authors cover role analysis technique (RAT) intervention in which role expectations and obligations of team members are clarified to improve team effectiveness. Step by step procedures are outlined, followed by specific examples. RAT is based on the premise that team consensus on each team member's role requirements will lead to more productive team behavior.

Chapter 11, "Intergroup Interventions," covers the use of team-building techniques for reducing intergroup conflict. It is assumed that teams in conflict would first have gone through some type of family group team-buiding process. One approach suggested by the authors is based on work done by Blake, Shepard and Mouton and involves both separate and joint meetings of the groups and exchanges of perceptions and information.

4.) Golembiewski, Robert T. Renewing Organizations: The Laboratory Approach to Planned Change. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1972.

This book is an overview of organization development from the perspective of a laboratory approach to learning. The theory and practice of interventions as applied to groups, individuals and organizations are discussed in detail. Part II specifies the array of team-building technology. This book helps bridge the gap between learning theory and applications for planned change.

5.) Harrison, R. "Role negotiation: a tough minded approach to team development," in The Social Technology of Organization Development. Edited by W. Burk and H. Hornstein. Fairfax, Virginia: NTL Learning Resources, 1972; pp. 84-96.

Harrison discussed the advantages and disadvantages of employing role negotiation techniques in team-building processes. He cites specific cases where the greater risk involved in role negotiation has paid off. The rest of this book is also useful for those needing more specific guidelines and models for OD technology.

6.) Huse, Edgar F. Organization Development and Change. New York: West Publishing, 1975: Chapter 9, "Intrapersonal Analysis and Relationships," pp. 274-265.

This chapter contrasts Team Building with laboratory training and encounter groups. It is very useful for the training officer attempting to differentiate between these techniques for clients. The remainder of the chapter describes approaches and results of laboratory training and encounter groups and a number of studies conducted.

7.) Alban, Billie T. and Pollitt, L. Irving. "Team Building," in OD - Emerging Dimensions and Concepts. Edited by T. H. Patten, Jr. American Society for Training and Development, 1973; pp. 33-42.

The authors are organizational consultants who draw upon their experiences to help clarify the concept of Team Building, differentiating it from T-Groups, and providing guidelines for persons interested in developing team-building programs. This latter section is particularly valuable in describing when and how Team Building starts, who should be included, the use of data feedback as part of Team Building, and exercises and theory inputs for team-building sessions.

C. For Researchers

1.) Dayal, Ishwar and Thomas, John M. "Operation KPE: Developing a New Organization," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 4 (October-November-December, 1968): pp. 473-506.

The paper describes a program of organization development in a new company. The authors state that this is one of the first attempts to use organization development with a virtually new organization. As part of the program, a team-building approach was used to solve a group-level problem of developing interdependence within the top management team. The Role Analysis

Technique (RAT) was applied to the problem of insufficient interdependence. Each role analysis consisted of three parts: discussion of the purpose of the role; its prescribed and discretionary components; and its linkages with other roles. One of the concluding points in the paper concerns the importance of developing concurrently at individual, group and organizational levels, so that Team Building is seen as an integral part of the organization development process.

2.) Friedlander, Frank and Brown, L. Dave. "Organization Development," Annual Review of Psychology 25 (1974); pp. 313-341.

The authors report on the impact of team-building activities by surveying the current literature. While noting that some studies have been completed on the effects of group intervention within the team, there is little evidence for the impact of Team Building outside the team. More importantly, there seems to be little understanding of the critical factors which differentiate successful group interventions from unsuccessful ones. A good OD bibliography is on pp. 336-341.

3.) Schmuck, R.; Runkel, P.; and Langemeyer, D. "Improving Organizational Problem Solving in a School Faculty," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 5 (October-November-December, 1969); pp. 445-482.

This article describes a study conducted on 54 school personnel, including faculty, staff and administrators. The program called for systematic interactions among the entire group, between subgroups and between dyads. Results indicated some positive changes in selected problem areas and comparisons are made with schools not involved in a team-building process over the same period.

We would appreciate any comments regarding this publication. Comments and requests for information should be addressed to:

Executive Personnel Technical Assistance Center (EPTAC)
Bureau of Executive Personnel
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, DC 20415

Area Code 202-632-4661

For Information about Executive Team Building Programs:

Federal Executive Institute
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Route 29 North
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Area Code 804-296-0181 or FTS 8-937-1295

General Management Training Center
Bureau of Training
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, DC 20415

Area Code 202-632-5671

For Information on Team Building Research:

Personnel Research and Development Center
Bureau of Policies and Standards
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, DC 20415

Area Code 202-632-6812

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1979 O—283-030